

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

Deborah S. Hunt
Clerk

100 EAST FIFTH STREET, ROOM 540
POTTER STEWART U.S. COURTHOUSE
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-3988

Tel. (513) 564-7000
www.ca6.uscourts.gov

Filed: August 01, 2017

Mr. Thomas J. Davis
Mr. Eric J. Pelton
Kienbaum, Oppenwall, Hardy & Pelton
280 N. Old Woodward Avenue, Suite 400
Birmingham, MI 48009

Mr. Michael E. Freifeld
Law Office of Glen N. Lenhoff
328 S. Saginaw Street
8th Floor, North Building
Flint, MI 48502

Re: Case No. 17-1093, *William Smith v. Melany Gavulic, et al*
Originating Case No. : 2:15-cv-10288

Dear Counsel,

The Court issued the enclosed opinion today in this case.

Sincerely yours,

s/Cathryn Lovely for Robin Johnson
Case Manager
Direct Dial No. 513-564-7039

cc: Mr. David J. Weaver

Enclosure

Mandate to issue

NOT RECOMMENDED FOR PUBLICATION
File Name: 17a0449n.06

No. 17-1093

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

WILLIAM D. SMITH,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

MELANY GAVULIC; HURLEY MEDICAL
CENTER,

Defendants-Appellees.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)



ON APPEAL FROM THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT
COURT FOR THE EASTERN
DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE: NORRIS, SUHRHEINRICH, and GRIFFIN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

In this employment-discrimination case, plaintiff William Smith, former General Counsel to Hurley Medical Center, appeals the district court's judgment granting summary judgment in favor of defendants Hurley and its CEO, Melany Gavulic. The case arises from Hurley's Board of Managers' decision to terminate Smith's employment on Gavulic's recommendation, which Smith alleges was an act of racial discrimination and retaliation for raising a complaint of racial discrimination against Gavulic. Smith's complaint alleged four types of claims: a racial discrimination claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a First Amendment retaliation claim, and violation of Michigan's Whistle-Blowers' Protection Act, M.C.L. § 15.361 et seq., and Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act, M.C.L. § 37.2101 et seq. The district court granted summary judgment in favor of defendants on each claim, and plaintiff appealed.

No. 17-1093, *Smith v. Gavulic, et al.*

After reviewing the record, the parties' briefs, and the applicable law, we conclude that the district court's thorough and well-written opinion correctly articulates and applies the applicable law to undisputed facts and that the issuance of a full written opinion by this court would serve no jurisprudential purpose. Accordingly, for the reasons stated in the district court's opinion, we affirm.